

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
8 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**  
9

10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 ALFRED T. SAPSE, and RALPH M.  
14 CONTI,

15 Defendants.

Case No. 2:10-CR-00370-KJD-RJJ

**ORDER**

16  
17 Presently before the Court is Defendant Ralph M. Conti's Motion *in Limine* (#131). Plaintiff  
18 filed a response in opposition (#137).

19 On page twenty-seven (27) of his motion, Defendant finally reveals that he is moving that the  
20 Government be ordered during the course of trial to refrain from "any mention of Food and Drug  
21 approval, 'unapproved products', or claim [sic] that the Food and Drug Administration had  
22 jurisdiction to regulate the conduct charged in this indictment." Having read and considered the  
23 motion and the Government's opposition, it is denied without prejudice.

24 Generally, a motion *in limine* may be used to exclude inadmissible or prejudicial evidence  
25 before it is offered at trial. See Luce v. U.S., 469 U.S. 38, 40 n.2 (1984). An order *in limine* avoids  
26 the futile attempt to "unring the bell" when jurors have seen or heard inadmissible evidence, even

1 when stricken from the record. See Brodit v. Cambra, 350 F.3d 985, 1004-1005 (9th Cir. 2003).  
2 Motion *in limine* may also save time by ruling on evidentiary disputes in advance, minimizing side-  
3 bar conferences and other disruptions at trial and potentially obviating the need to call certain  
4 witnesses. See United States v. Tokash, 282 F.3d 962, 968 (7th Cir. 2002).

5 In this case, the Government agrees that the Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) does not  
6 regulate the practice of medicine. Instead, the Government argues that the FDA does regulate  
7 products, in this instance, human placental tissue. Further, the charges are for conspiracy and wire  
8 and mail fraud related to alleged misrepresentations made by Sapse and Conti in order to obtain,  
9 fraudulently, money from patients and investors by providing implantation of human placental tissue.  
10 Thus, without first hearing the foundation laid by the Government, it would be impossible to tell  
11 whether statements related to “Food and Drug approval”, “unapproved products”, or “FDA  
12 jurisdiction to regulate” were relevant to the charges in this action or not relevant.

13 To the extent that Defendant Conti seeks an order declaring the existence of the FDA, FDA  
14 regulations in general, or regulation of ‘human placental tissue’ unconstitutional under the  
15 Commerce Clause, the Court denies the motion.

16 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant Ralph M. Conti’s Motion *in Limine*  
17 (#131) is **DENIED**.

18 DATED this 29<sup>th</sup> day of October 2012.

19  
20  
21 

22 Kent J. Dawson  
23 United States District Judge  
24  
25  
26